

## Utah Housing and Community Development 2015 Comprehensive Annual Performance Evaluation Report

### CR-05 - Goals and Outcomes

#### Progress the jurisdiction has made in carrying out its strategic plan and its action plan. 91.520(a)

This could be an overview that includes major initiatives and highlights that were proposed and executed throughout the program year.

In creating our goals for the 2014 program year the state of Utah created a large number of categories based off of old methods of tabulating our results. In the past Utah would count total units constructed and rehabilitated and then also add

#### Comparison of the proposed versus actual outcomes for each outcome measure submitted with the consolidated plan and explain, if applicable, why progress was not made toward meeting goals and objectives. 91.520(g)

Categories, priority levels, funding sources and amounts, outcomes/objectives, goal outcome indicators, units of measure, targets, actual outcomes/outputs, and percentage completed for each of the grantee's program year goals.

Goal	Category	Source / Amount	Indicator	Unit of Measure	Expected – Strategic Plan	Actual – Strategic Plan	Percent Complete	Expected – Program Year	Actual – Program Year	Percent Complete
Affordable Home Ownership	Affordable Housing	HOME: \$1000000	Homeowner Housing Added	Household Housing Unit	0	0		100	0	0.00%
Affordable Housing	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$500000 / HOME: \$2500000	Rental units constructed	Household Housing Unit	0	0		550	702	127.64%

Affordable Housing	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$500000 / HOME: \$2500000	Rental units rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	0	0		120	126	105.00%
Affordable Housing	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$500000 / HOME: \$2500000	Homeowner Housing Added	Household Housing Unit	0	0		85	46	54.12%
Affordable Housing	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$500000 / HOME: \$2500000	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	0	0		110	91	82.73%
Eliminate Chronic Homelessness	Homeless	ESG: \$1110759	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	Households Assisted	0	0		300	366	122.00%
Eliminate Chronic Homelessness	Homeless	ESG: \$1110759	Homeless Person Overnight Shelter	Persons Assisted	0	0		7150	10208	142.77%
Improve public infrastructure in rural Utah	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$2000000	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	0	0		5000	8614	172.28%
Provide Accessible Housing	Affordable Housing	HOME: \$60000	Rental units constructed	Household Housing Unit	0	0		35	105	300.00%
Provide Accessible Housing	Affordable Housing	HOME: \$60000	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	0	0		10	17	170.00%

Provide Economic Development for Rural Utah	Economic Development	CDBG: \$160000	Jobs created/retained	Jobs	0	0		100	145	145.00%
Provide housing for persons with HIV/AIDS	Affordable Housing	HOPWA: \$153214	Housing for People with HIV/AIDS added	Household Housing Unit	0	0		59	102	172.88%
Provide Supportive Services for Homeless	Homeless	ESG: \$1110759	Other	Other	0	0		5000	6113	122.26%
Special Needs Housing	Affordable Housing	HOME: \$100000	Rental units constructed	Household Housing Unit	0	0		50	118	236.00%

**Table 1 - Accomplishments – Program Year & Strategic Plan to Date**

**Assess how the jurisdiction's use of funds, particularly CDBG, addresses the priorities and specific objectives identified in the plan, giving special attention to the highest priority activities identified.**

## CR-10 - Racial and Ethnic composition of families assisted

Describe the families assisted (including the racial and ethnic status of families assisted).

91.520(a)

	CDBG	HOME	HOPWA	ESG
White	377	169	66	2,164
Black or African American	0	2	21	251
Asian	0	9	2	49
American Indian or American Native	2	7	0	189
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	42
<b>Total</b>	<b>379</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>2,695</b>
Hispanic	1	15	20	452
Not Hispanic	378	172	69	2,133

Table 2 – Table of assistance to racial and ethnic populations by source of funds

### Narrative

## CR-15 - Resources and Investments 91.520(a)

### Identify the resources made available

Source of Funds	Source	Resources Made Available	Amount Expended During Program Year
CDBG		4,398,980	
HOME		6,862,487	3,350,000
HOPWA		153,214	193,064
ESG		1,110,759	1,017,936

Table 3 – Resources Made Available

### Narrative

The Utah HOME Program has also committed 2.5 Million Dollars towards the creation of a Transit Oriented Development Fund which has yet to be dispursed. This is the main reason why the amount expended during the program year is below the amount of funds made available.

### Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Target Area	Planned Percentage of Allocation	Actual Percentage of Allocation	Narrative Description
Bear River Association of Governments	7	7	
Five County Association of Governments	6	6	
Mountainland Association of Governments	6	6	
Six County Association of Governments	10	10	
Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments	6	6	
State of Utah	52	52	
Uintah Basin Association of Governments	7	7	
Wasatch Front Regional Council	6	6	

Table 4 – Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

### Narrative

## Leveraging

**Explain how federal funds leveraged additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements were satisfied, as well as how any publicly owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that were used to address the needs identified in the plan.**

\*Please Review\*

Two State funds are used to match ESG. Pamela Atkinson Homeless Trust Fund (PAHTF) is used to provide services to homeless individuals throughout the state. It is used as an HMIS support, shelter staff, shelter case management, shelter operations and maintenance, street outreach, CoC support staff, PSH case management, contributed to the building of new shelters, and other activities supporting the goal to end homelessness throughout the State of Utah. This fund is \$4,058,730 in total. \$1.5 million of PAHTF was allocated towards building new facilities to support persons experiencing homelessness. Critical Needs Housing (CNH) in state FY15 totaled \$497,520 and was used for the same types of activities.

<b>Fiscal Year Summary – HOME Match</b>	
1. Excess match from prior Federal fiscal year	2,531,904
2. Match contributed during current Federal fiscal year	0
3. Total match available for current Federal fiscal year (Line 1 plus Line 2)	2,531,904
4. Match liability for current Federal fiscal year	634,360
5. Excess match carried over to next Federal fiscal year (Line 3 minus Line 4)	1,897,544

**Table 5 – Fiscal Year Summary - HOME Match Report**

Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year								
Project No. or Other ID	Date of Contribution	Cash (non-Federal sources)	Foregone Taxes, Fees, Charges	Appraised Land/Real Property	Required Infrastructure	Site Preparation, Construction Materials, Donated labor	Bond Financing	Total Match

Table 6 – Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year

### HOME MBE/WBE report

Program Income – Enter the program amounts for the reporting period				
Balance on hand at begin- ning of reporting period \$	Amount received during reporting period \$	Total amount expended during reporting period \$	Amount expended for TBRA \$	Balance on hand at end of reporting period \$
7,551,548	4,046,248	3,928,885	0	7,668,912

Table 7 – Program Income

Minority Business Enterprises and Women Business Enterprises – Indicate the number and dollar value of contracts for HOME projects completed during the reporting period						
	Total	Minority Business Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Contracts						
Dollar Amount	21,430,316	0	0	0	0	21,430,316
Number	49	0	0	0	0	49
Sub-Contracts						
Number	12	0	0	0	0	12
Dollar Amount	9,724,210	0	0	0	0	9,724,210
	Total	Women Business Enterprises	Male			
Contracts						
Dollar Amount	21,430,316	500,000	20,930,316			
Number	49	2	47			
Sub-Contracts						
Number	13	0	13			
Dollar Amount	9,895,758	0	9,895,758			

**Table 8 – Minority Business and Women Business Enterprises**

<b>Minority Owners of Rental Property – Indicate the number of HOME assisted rental property owners and the total amount of HOME funds in these rental properties assisted</b>						
	<b>Total</b>	<b>Minority Property Owners</b>				<b>White Non-Hispanic</b>
		<b>Alaskan Native or American Indian</b>	<b>Asian or Pacific Islander</b>	<b>Black Non-Hispanic</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	
Number	20	0	0	0	0	20
Dollar Amount	30,000	0	0	0	0	30,000

**Table 9 – Minority Owners of Rental Property**



<b>Relocation and Real Property Acquisition</b> – Indicate the number of persons displaced, the cost of relocation payments, the number of parcels acquired, and the cost of acquisition						
Parcels Acquired		3		3,833,499		
Businesses Displaced		0		0		
Nonprofit Organizations Displaced		0		0		
Households Temporarily Relocated, not Displaced		48		44,875		
Households Displaced	Total	Minority Property Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Number	1	0	0	0	0	1
Cost	1,270	0	0	0	0	1,270

**Table 10 – Relocation and Real Property Acquisition**

## CR-20 - Affordable Housing 91.520(b)

Evaluation of the jurisdiction's progress in providing affordable housing, including the number and types of families served, the number of extremely low-income, low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income persons served.

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	300	366
Number of Non-Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	1,145	165
Number of Special-Needs households to be provided affordable housing units	0	46
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,445</b>	<b>577</b>

Table 11 – Number of Households

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of households supported through Rental Assistance	359	366
Number of households supported through The Production of New Units	642	201
Number of households supported through Rehab of Existing Units	367	0
Number of households supported through Acquisition of Existing Units	77	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,445</b>	<b>567</b>

Table 12 – Number of Households Supported

**Discuss the difference between goals and outcomes and problems encountered in meeting these goals.**

During the 2014 program year the Utah HOME program made the decision to support the creation of a Transit Oriented Development Fund. 2.5 Million dollars has been set aside for this fund. This fund has already received commitments from numerous banks who are interested in using the fund as a means of expending CDA funds. While this fund is an excellent opportunity to leverage HOME dollars, it has not yet resulted in the completion of new units and as a result the actual production for the 2-14 program year is down.

**Discuss how these outcomes will impact future annual action plans.**

The Utah HOME program expects that in coming years the TOD Fund will result in a high production of affordable units.

Include the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income persons served by each activity where information on income by family size is required to determine the eligibility of the activity.

Number of Persons Served	CDBG Actual	HOME Actual
Extremely Low-income	0	0
Low-income	46	3
Moderate-income	0	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>6</b>

Table 13 – Number of Persons Served

### Narrative Information

## **CR-25 - Homeless and Other Special Needs 91.220(d, e); 91.320(d, e); 91.520(c)**

**Evaluate the jurisdiction's progress in meeting its specific objectives for reducing and ending homelessness through:**

### **Reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs**

The state of Utah has made a concerted effort to identify homeless persons, especially those who are not currently accessing emergency shelter, and align them with services designed to end their homelessness. This is evidenced greatly in how ESG and matching funds are allocated and prioritized.

The State of Utah has not allocated any of its State or ESG funds to homeless prevention activities since evidence has shown that there are no reliable indicators that will predict what household will become homeless and what household will be able to remain in permanent housing. We have instead designated TANF funds to provide both homeless prevention and rapid rehousing services to address this need. As ESG funds that would have been allocated to homeless prevention are then prioritized to those who are literally homeless it is definitively addressing the needs of those who are experiencing homelessness. Additionally, ESG funding has been primarily funding rapid rehousing and street outreach activities. As programs identify unsheltered persons through street outreach efforts they are assessed for their need with an emphasis on aligning them with other resources that will lead to permanent housing. There are ten outreach teams throughout the state that focus exclusively on street outreach and all play a different role to fulfill the specific needs of the population they are serving.

The Balance of State and Mountainlands Continua of Care have formally adopted the SPDAT and VI-SPDAT assessment tools which aid in assessing an individual or family's need. These assessments are also integrated into HMIS where a prioritization list based on vulnerability is drawn from and serviced allocated based on those who are in most need. Though the Salt Lake and Tooele Continuum of Care has not adopted this as a tool in their coordinated assessment providers are using it to assess the needs of those experiencing chronic homelessness. This too, is then used as a factor in aligning resources to those who are vulnerable.

### **Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons**

There are homeless shelters in key locations throughout the state where those experiencing homelessness can access their services. Where facilities are not available there are motel voucher programs in place through local government agencies, non-profits, or religious institutions. During the 2014 calendar year, Switchpoint emergency shelter was opened in St. George and in early 2015 The Lantern House emergency shelter opened in Ogden. Switchpoint added 72 additional year-round beds. The opening of The Lantern House replaced an old facility and increased their year-round beds. In Salt Lake County the Midvale Overflow Shelter operated by The Road Home offers 445 seasonal beds during winter months. This facility has been torn down and is presently being rebuilt. The new facility will

substantially increase the quality of life of those seeking shelter within its walls.

HCD has played an active role in increasing shelter capacity both in these facilities by allocating state funds in their construction, but has also allocated rapid rehousing funds either directly to organizations providing shelter or to partnering agencies within their communities. As more households are able to quickly exit shelter into permanent housing the shelters are able to increase the number served without increasing the number of beds available.

Transitional housing has been largely phased out of the homeless services system throughout the State of Utah. The remaining transitional housing units are primarily serving victims of domestic violence and youth. Facilities that formerly offered transitional housing have been converted to permanent and permanent supportive housing.

**Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again**

As previously stated, our communities are seeking to rapidly rehouse individuals and families experiencing homelessness and have prioritized these activities. With the State providing TANF homeless prevention and rapid rehousing, ESG and state funds to non-profits and AOGs there are resources available to prevent and end homelessness throughout most of the populous in the state. These programs have financial assistance and supportive services to assist their participants connect with resources and fully integrate back into their communities.

As HUD has released system performance measures that will inspect how our state's homeless service delivery system is performing as a whole, we have adopted many of these measures and incorporated them into a quarterly reporting requirement in our programs. This method will allow us to look at specific programs and track how quickly they are moving families out of homelessness into permanent housing. This effort will greatly inform the areas of need within the state and show the level at which our current programs are performing. The areas examined will be inclusive of the performance measures, but also examine the effect of case management in permanent supportive housing through the use of the SPDAT as a case management tool to show progress made in decreasing the acuity of the residents of these programs. Rapid Rehousing programs will have retention in permanent housing over 6 months, 6-12 months, and 12-24 months as an integral focus in their service deliver. As these are reviewed on a quarterly basis we will be able to examine length of assistance, cost per client, exits to permanent housing, increase in non-employment and employment income, enrollments in mainstream benefits and length of homelessness prior to entry which will show the true outcome and effect of the program dollars being expended.

In early 2015, the three CoC's in the Utah convened with the support of Community Solutions to set aims with the goal of ending chronic homelessness and veteran homelessness by 2016. As we are participating in the Zero:2016 initiative, each CoC has set specific goals tailored to their communities and populations. These include tailoring services to the need of each client, maximizing efficiencies and efficacy of housing programs, improving coordinated access processes, prioritizing resources, and maximizing HMIS data to assist in housing placements. Through this push, and a subsequent planning group on achieving effective zero homeless veterans, we are striving to better the systems in place and end/reduce homelessness among chronically homeless and all veterans.

**Helping low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families and those who are: likely to become homeless after being discharged from publicly funded institutions and systems of care (such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions); and, receiving assistance from public or private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education, or youth needs**

In many of the communities state-wide there are several systems in place to assist low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless. Community Action Programs and other non-profits provide wrap around services to address poverty and HCD is committed to supporting these efforts. TANF, HOPWA and CSBG grants are distributed state-wide to provide financial assistance to those who are extremely low-income and require short-term assistance in order to stabilize their housing.

The Utah Department of Human Services' (DHS) Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) Practice Guidelines require a transition plan be developed at least 90 days prior to discharge with youth exiting foster care at age 18 and prohibits discharge to homelessness. Persons exiting foster care are routinely discharged to family members, foster parents, independent living situations such as apartments, student housing, and other supervised living conditions. HCD supports the Homeless Youth Resource Center (HYRC) run through Volunteers of America. The HYRC provides case management, street outreach, and a drop-in center for at risk youth and homeless youth. VOA also assists youths with transitional housing to provide stability as they are working towards self-sufficiency.

Utah Department of Corrections in conjunction with the Utah Board of Pardons and Parole commit to not release state inmates on parole to a homeless shelter or into a homeless situation. Paroling inmates must have a residence that has been verified by AP&P agents prior to release or be assigned to a UDC Community Corrections Center for housing. Efforts are made to ensure that the residence is suitable housing. Additionally, services are provided to inmates to reduce recidivism and housing stability. There have been several programs implemented to provide additional layers of support as well. Women's Assistance and Reentry Mentoring (WARM), Re-Entry Assistance Program (REAP), and Your Parole Requires Extensive Preparation (YPREP) are a few examples of programs that assist those transitioning from incarceration.

Intermountain Healthcare (IHC) is one of the largest hospital systems in the State and is an active

participant in the State Homeless Coordinating Committee. IHC discharge policies require initiation of a discharge plan for every patient upon admission. Local homeless serving non-profits work with hospitals to work towards nobody being discharged into homelessness. Hospitals are able to contact them and align patients with housing options through geographically relevant shelters. TriCounty Services coordinates with local providers to ensure individuals being discharged from long-term nursing facilities have resources to prevent homelessness.

The Utah Department of Human Services participates on the State Homeless coordinating Council's Discharge Planning Sub-Committee, in conjunction with the continuums of care, coordinate resources and develop discharge plans to assure individuals being discharged from mental health facilities are not exiting into homelessness. The Utah Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health (DSAMH) promotes home and community based services and supportive services provided by the local community mental health centers and substance abuse agencies to help decrease risk factors and link patients to services. DSAMH uses a tracking system to document needed services that are received by patients ready for discharge from State Hospital.

### **CR-30 - Public Housing 91.220(h); 91.320(j)**

#### **Actions taken to address the needs of public housing**

HCD does not fund Public Housing.

#### **Actions taken to encourage public housing residents to become more involved in management and participate in homeownership**

HCD does not fund Public Housing.

#### **Actions taken to provide assistance to troubled PHAs**

HCD does not fund Public Housing.



## **CR-35 - Other Actions 91.220(j)-(k); 91.320(i)-(j)**

**Actions taken to remove or ameliorate the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing such as land use controls, tax policies affecting land, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment. 91.220 (j); 91.320 (i)**

As a state agency it is difficult to remove or ameliorate any possible negative effect local policies have. Nevertheless the State of Utah is an active participant in the Utah League of Cities and Towns, and members of the Olene Walker Loan Fund support the state Fair Housing Forum, the Utah Apartment Association Annual Fair Housing Conference, and provide numerous training regarding fair housing.

### **Actions taken to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)**

The biggest obstacle to underserved needs in the small cities CDBG program is the lack of adequate funding. As cities and counties have grown in population and left the state program, the annual allocation has dropped from a high of \$8.2 million in 2003 to only \$4.47 in 2015. There simply isn't enough funding to meet the community development needs of the communities. Critical infrastructure projects; water, sewer, and public safety continue to be a high priority. With only \$500,000 - \$600,000 available in most regions, only one or two of these projects can be funded in each region, and their size and scope is limited. The regional rating and ranking systems award additional points for leveraged funds and this encourages applicants to seek matching funds for their projects. This system maximizes the CDBG impact throughout the state.

### **Actions taken to reduce lead-based paint hazards. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)**

The biggest obstacle to underserved needs in the small cities CDBG program is the lack of adequate funding. As cities and counties have grown in population and left the state program, the annual allocation has dropped from a high of \$8.2 million in 2003 to only \$4.47 in 2015. There simply isn't enough funding to meet the community development needs of the communities. Critical infrastructure projects; water, sewer, and public safety continue to be a high priority. With only \$500,000 - \$600,000 available in most regions, only one or two of these projects can be funded in each region, and their size and scope is limited. The regional rating and ranking systems awards additional points for leveraged funds and this encourages applicants to seek matching funds for their projects. This system maximizes the CDBG impact throughout the state.

### **Actions taken to reduce the number of poverty-level families. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)**

The small annual CDBG allocation combined with Utah's method of distribution makes it difficult to fund programs designed to reduce the number of poverty level families. By statute, the state's allocation is divided by seven regional organizations and these organizations have the authority and control over which projects will be funded. Since public service type projects are limited to 15% of the annual

allocation, job training programs are uncommon. Instead, the priorities for 2015 continue to be community infrastructure improvements and affordable housing. Single family housing rehab programs throughout the state preserve the affordable housing stock in the rural areas and improve the housing conditions for poverty-level families; but do not reduce their numbers. A small allocation was awarded to one region to provide technical assistance to low income business owners, but no funding was awarded for loans to such businesses.

**Actions taken to develop institutional structure. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)**

The CDBG program allocates funding to seven regional organizations. Application workshops are held throughout the state and the 10 housing authorities located in the non-entitlement areas are invited to apply for funding through eligible applicants (cities and counties). Decent, safe, affordable housing is a priority in Utah and CDBG funding is used by the housing authorities to acquire, retain and rehabilitate affordable housing throughout the state. Since CDBG funds cannot be used to construct housing, acquisition projects are often leveraged with HOME funds for new single and multi-family housing projects carried out by private developers. Area social service agencies were invited to apply and in 2015 CDBG funds were used to purchase a meals on wheels truck for an aging services program.

**Actions taken to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)**

The State ESG Program was a partner on the Utah State Homelessness Coordinating Committee. The State Homeless Coordinating Committee is committed to coordinating the efforts of public private and social service agencies in addressing homelessness. HCD's efforts have been a valuable contribution towards achieving the goal of overcoming chronic homelessness. However, equally important this Committee has pioneered efforts in Utah in showing the value and feasibility of coordination between public private and social service agencies. The Olene Walker housing loan fund also reaches out to both public private and social service agencies in its efforts. HCD works with cities, non-profits, and private developers and contractors in the course of completing its work.

The CDBG program allocates funding to seven regional organizations. Application workshops were held throughout the state and the 10 housing authorities located in the non-entitlement areas are invited to apply for funding through eligible applicants (cities and counties). Decent, safe, affordable housing is a priority in Utah and CDBG funding is used by the housing authorities to acquire, retain and rehabilitate affordable housing throughout the state. Since CDBG funds cannot be used to construct housing, acquisition projects were leveraged with HOME funds for new single and multi-family housing projects carried out by private developers. Area social service agencies were invited to apply and in 2015 CDBG funds were used to purchase a meals on wheels truck for an aging services program.

**Identify actions taken to overcome the effects of any impediments identified in the jurisdictions analysis of impediments to fair housing choice. 91.520(a)**



## **CR-40 - Monitoring 91.220 and 91.230**

**Describe the standards and procedures used to monitor activities carried out in furtherance of the plan and used to ensure long-term compliance with requirements of the programs involved, including minority business outreach and the comprehensive planning requirements**

### **CDBG**

The State CDBG staff monitors all projects for program and financial compliance. This is carried out either via desk audit or on-site visit depending on the size and complexity of the project. CDBG has also hired a financial auditor to assist in the task of auditing our recipients. We expect this hire to greatly improve our ability to oversee the recipients and ensure proper compliance. Not all 2014 projects are completed at this time, but all beneficiaries are ultimately recorded in IDIS at the time of project closeout.

### **HOME**

HCD maintains a full year schedule of monitoring assignments for property compliance to federal and state program requirements. A checklist used by the HCD monitoring staff insures that projects continue to target low-income populations for the duration of the loan term (generally 30 years). For 2014-15, HCD staff completed 171 compliance monitoring visits to individual multifamily properties.

During the program year, HCD focused monitoring on occupancy of set aside units. This focus insures that property originally targeted for a certain population group (disabled, chronically mentally ill, developmentally delayed, victims of domestic violence, elderly, homeless, AIDS victims, and persons needing transitional housing) are occupied by residents of that group. The results of HCD's focus show that units are occupied by income eligible households. However, only 79% of the units are occupied by residents of a targeted special needs population. HCD staff has established protocols for property managers to better fill units with special needs residents.

### **ESG**

Part of the ESG pre-application process was a state-wide training to familiarize agencies with the requirements and expectations of the ESG grant. After agencies were allocated funds, a second and more in-depth training was provided followed by on-going training and technical assistance as needed. Each agency was required to provide an ESG Policy and Procedure Manual for review by the State ESG Program Specialist. Agencies were given a list of required policies and procedures as well as an ESG Monitoring Tool that was used by the state specialist during yearly on-site and/or desk top monitoring inspections. Agencies were required to submit online requests for reimbursement with back-up documentation at least quarterly. Each first request was reviewed in detail by the SCSO Field Audit Supervisor and all following requests were reviewed by program specialists with random spot checks by

the Field Audit Supervisor. UHMIS reports were pulled quarterly for review and comparison of agency activity and progress. When applicable, ESG monitoring was conducted in conjunction with CoC monitors and fellow ESG recipients to sub recipients who receive ESG funding from multiple sources.

**HOPWA** contracts have received both desktop and on site reviews during this fiscal year with no findings to be reported.

#### **Citizen Participation Plan 91.105(d); 91.115(d)**

##### **Describe the efforts to provide citizens with reasonable notice and an opportunity to comment on performance reports.**

As required HCD notified the public of the CAPER being published on HCD's website. This 30 day public comment period began on August 31. On September 31st and conducted a public hearing on Sep 30th, 2015. The following is the text of the public notice as posted in local newspapers:

The Utah Housing and Community Development Division (HCD) will hold a public hearing on September 30, 2015, beginning at 8:00 am at 1385 So State St., Room 157A, to hear comments about the 2014-15 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER). HCD will receive comments until 5:00 pm that same day. A copy of the report is posted on <http://housing.utah.gov/owhlf/report.html>. *Equal Opportunity Employer Program* - Auxiliary aids and services are available upon request to individuals with disabilities by calling 801-526-9240. Individuals with speech and/or hearing impairments may call the Relay Utah by dialing 711. Spanish Relay Utah: 1-888-346-3162

Aside from this public notice, additional notices were placed in the state public notice registry found online at: <http://www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html>. Also community partners and were notified through email of the CAPER being published online and available for comment.

**CR-45 - CDBG 91.520(c)**

**Specify the nature of, and reasons for, any changes in the jurisdiction's program objectives and indications of how the jurisdiction would change its programs as a result of its experiences.**

<b>Does this Jurisdiction have any open Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) grants?</b>	<b>No</b>
--	-----------

**[BEDI grantees] Describe accomplishments and program outcomes during the last year.**

**CR-50 - HOME 91.520(d)**

**Include the results of on-site inspections of affordable rental housing assisted under the program to determine compliance with housing codes and other applicable regulations**

Please list those projects that should have been inspected on-site this program year based upon the schedule in §92.504(d). Indicate which of these were inspected and a summary of issues that were detected during the inspection. For those that were not inspected, please indicate the reason and how you will remedy the situation.

**Provide an assessment of the jurisdiction's affirmative marketing actions for HOME units. 92.351(b)**

**Refer to IDIS reports to describe the amount and use of program income for projects, including the number of projects and owner and tenant characteristics**

**Describe other actions taken to foster and maintain affordable housing. 91.220(k) (STATES ONLY: Including the coordination of LIHTC with the development of affordable housing). 91.320(j)**

## CR-55 - HOPWA 91.520(e)

### Identify the number of individuals assisted and the types of assistance provided

Table for report on the one-year goals for the number of households provided housing through the use of HOPWA activities for: short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance payments to prevent homelessness of the individual or family; tenant-based rental assistance; and units provided in housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds.

Number of Households Served Through:	One-year Goal	Actual
Short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance to prevent homelessness of the individual or family	14	40
Tenant-based rental assistance	31	35
Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	9	12
Units provided in transitional short-term housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	5	5

Table 14 – HOPWA Number of Households Served

### Narrative



## CR-60 - ESG 91.520(g) (ESG Recipients only)

### ESG Supplement to the CAPER in *e-snaps*

#### For Paperwork Reduction Act

#### 1. Recipient Information—All Recipients Complete

##### Basic Grant Information

Recipient Name	UTAH
Organizational DUNS Number	878147099
EIN/TIN Number	876000545
Identify the Field Office	DENVER
Identify CoC(s) in which the recipient or subrecipient(s) will provide ESG assistance	Salt Lake City & County CoC

##### ESG Contact Name

Prefix	0
First Name	Pema
Middle Name	0
Last Name	Chagzoetsang
Suffix	0
Title	0

##### ESG Contact Address

Street Address 1	1385 S. State Street
Street Address 2	0
City	Salt Lake City
State	UT
ZIP Code	84115-
Phone Number	8014680149
Extension	0
Fax Number	0
Email Address	pchagzoe@utah.gov

##### ESG Secondary Contact

Prefix	
First Name	
Last Name	
Suffix	
Title	
Phone Number	
Extension	
Email Address	

#### 2. Reporting Period—All Recipients Complete

CAPER

25

**Program Year Start Date** 07/01/2014  
**Program Year End Date** 06/30/2015

**3a. Subrecipient Form – Complete one form for each subrecipient**

**Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** ST. ANNES CENTER

**City:** Ogden

**State:** UT

**Zip Code:** 84401, 3417

**DUNS Number:** 185519188

**Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N

**Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization

**ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 100000

**Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** THE ROAD HOME

**City:** Salt Lake City

**State:** UT

**Zip Code:** 84101, 1104

**DUNS Number:** 870212465

**Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N

**Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization

**ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 336321.05

**Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** WASATCH MENTAL HEALTH (SSD)

**City:** Provo

**State:** UT

**Zip Code:** 84601, 1690

**DUNS Number:** 167100721

**Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N

**Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization

**ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 35750

**Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA

**City:** Salt Lake City

**State:** UT

**Zip Code:** 84101, 1116

**DUNS Number:** 931851265

**Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N

**Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization

**ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 348298

**Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** Family Promise Salt Lake

**City:** Salt Lake City

**State:** UT

**Zip Code:** 84110, 0996

**DUNS Number:** 126327969

**Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N

**Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization

**ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 61000

**Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** Iron County Care and Share Inc

**City:** Cedar City

**State:** UT

**Zip Code:** 84721, 2241

**DUNS Number:** 612667147

**Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N

**Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization

**ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 97700

**Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** Family Connection Center

**City:** Clearfield

**State:** UT

**Zip Code:** 84015, 1611

**DUNS Number:** 556422442

**Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N

**Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization

**ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 70000

**Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** Valley Mental Health

**City:** Murray

**State:** UT

**Zip Code:** 84121, 1720

**DUNS Number:** 177304805

**Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N

**Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization

**ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 63698.89

**Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** Community Action Services

**City:** Provo

**State:** UT

**Zip Code:** 84601, 5817

**DUNS Number:** 802215194

**Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N

**Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization

**ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 2342.44

## CR-65 - Persons Assisted

### 4. Persons Served

#### 4a. Complete for Homelessness Prevention Activities

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	0
Children	0
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 15 – Household Information for Homeless Prevention Activities

#### 4b. Complete for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	435
Children	227
Don't Know/Refused/Other	2
Missing Information	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>665</b>

Table 16 – Household Information for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

#### 4c. Complete for Shelter

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	831
Children	140
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>971</b>

Table 17 – Shelter Information

#### 4d. Street Outreach

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	1,115
Children	1
Don't Know/Refused/Other	18
Missing Information	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,135</b>

Table 18 – Household Information for Street Outreach

#### 4e. Totals for all Persons Served with ESG

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	2,249
Children	341
Don't Know/Refused/Other	20
Missing Information	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,612</b>

Table 19 – Household Information for Persons Served with ESG

#### 5. Gender—Complete for All Activities

	Total
Male	1,378
Female	1,227
Transgender	7
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,612</b>

Table 20 - Gender Information

## 6. Age—Complete for All Activities

	<b>Total</b>
Under 18	341
18-24	223
25 and over	2,026
Don't Know/Refused/Other	20
Missing Information	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,612</b>

**Table 21 – Age Information**

## 7. Special Populations Served—Complete for All Activities

### Number of Persons in Households

<b>Subpopulation</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Total Persons Served – Prevention</b>	<b>Total Persons Served – RRH</b>	<b>Total Persons Served in Emergency Shelters</b>
Veterans	192	0	49	46
Victims of Domestic Violence	182	0	78	97
Elderly	120	0	22	28
HIV/AIDS	6	0	0	2
Chronically Homeless	659	0	127	142
<b>Persons with Disabilities:</b>				
Severely Mentally Ill	709	0	121	134
Chronic Substance Abuse	851	0	53	315
Other Disability	435	0	135	163
Total (Unduplicated if possible)	0	0	0	0

**Table 22 – Special Population Served**

<b>Veterans</b>	<b>106</b>
Victims of DV	26
Elderly	77
HIV/AIDS	4
Chronically Homeless	451
Persons With Disabilities:	

Severely Mentally Ill	494
Chronic Substance Abuse	543
Other Disability	170

**Table 23 - Street Outreach Subpopulations**



## CR-70 – ESG 91.520(g) - Assistance Provided and Outcomes

### 10. Shelter Utilization

Number of New Units - Rehabbed	0
Number of New Units - Conversion	27,740
Total Number of bed-nights available	691,495
Total Number of bed-nights provided	559,144
Capacity Utilization	80.86%

**Table 24 – Shelter Capacity**

### 11. Project Outcomes Data measured under the performance standards developed in consultation with the CoC(s)

The state of Utah has presently developed agency specific performance measures in anticipation of the HUD system performance measures being released. We will be monitoring these measures on a quarterly basis with all agencies receiving ESG funding and will be establishing a baseline in which improvements will be measured and targets set in order to achieve federal goals. The performance measures for emergency shelter are:

## CR-75 – Expenditures

### 11. Expenditures

#### 11a. ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2012	2013	2014
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	0	0	0
Expenditures for Homeless Prevention under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	0	0	0
<b>Subtotal Homelessness Prevention</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 25 – ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

#### 11b. ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2012	2013	2014
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	258,484	381,261	435,050
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	0	0	0
Expenditures for Homeless Assistance under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	0	0	0
<b>Subtotal Rapid Re-Housing</b>	<b>258,484</b>	<b>381,261</b>	<b>435,050</b>

Table 26 – ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

#### 11c. ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2012	2013	2014
Essential Services	0	0	0
Operations	659,885	206,615	158,686
Renovation	0	0	0
Major Rehab	0	0	0
Conversion	0	0	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>659,885</b>	<b>206,615</b>	<b>158,686</b>

Table 27 – ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

**11d. Other Grant Expenditures**

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2012	2013	2014
HMIS	100,000	5,000	45,005
Administration	82,570	57,570	59,450
Street Outreach	0	171,995	319,745

Table 28 - Other Grant Expenditures

**11e. Total ESG Grant Funds**

Total ESG Funds Expended	2012	2013	2014
2,449,576	1,100,939	650,446	698,191

Table 29 - Total ESG Funds Expended

**11f. Match Source**

	2012	2013	2014
Other Non-ESG HUD Funds	0	0	0
Other Federal Funds	0	0	0
State Government	861,277	823,705	1,317,766
Local Government	0	0	0
Private Funds	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0
Program Income	0	0	0
<b>Total Match Amount</b>	<b>861,277</b>	<b>823,705</b>	<b>1,317,766</b>

Table 30 - Other Funds Expended on Eligible ESG Activities

**11g. Total**

Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities	2012	2013	2014
5,452,324	1,962,216	1,474,151	2,015,957

Table 31 - Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities